



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

is a blur indeed. To repeat, the only attempt to face that problem was the Prinkipo proposal, which was a practical recognition of Bolshevism, a scheme which ended in deserved failure. In the meantime, the possibilities that Russia may become a German colony have apparently increased. The tragedy of this lies in the prospects of an alliance against the so-called League of Nations. The possibility that Japan might join with Russia in such an alliance in case she failed in her ambitions toward China, has not been calculated to promote one's peace of mind in Paris.

It is charged that Mr. Wilson has shown no appreciation of the serious condition facing France. With her main industrial center destroyed, the one thing that France has wanted to know is the amount she might reasonably expect from Germany. It has been impossible for France to fix a budget, to plan her industries or to adjust her affairs. While she has been asking what she might reasonably expect in order that these matters might be attended to and a degree of normal life begun again, America has been sending food to the Germans, demanding gold in payment, while Mr. Wilson has insisted upon talking simply about the League of Nations. American experts are passing upon the financial claims of French manufacturers who have lost essentially their all in the mining and manufacturing areas of the Northeast. These American experts, representing the President, have submitted at times reports adverse to the claims of the French. There may be cases where the French claims have been excessive; I do not know about this. I do know that American experts sitting in Paris criticised the claims of one iron master who resubmitted his claims, after which they were reviewed on the ground by two other American experts and approved. This kind of self-contradictory procedure has had its effect upon Mr. Wilson's reputation in France.

Mr. Wilson chafes under the restraint of precedents, in consequence of which he aims to belittle their importance. He criticizes the lawyers. He ignores the achievements of justice. He appeals over the heads of Grotius, Vattel and the long line of the constructive great and able, to the passions of the untrained. While attempting to eject the trained diplomats out of one door he has let the untrained politicians in at the other. With the phrases "common council," "open covenants openly arrived at," "democracy and humanity" upon his lips, he is standing for a super-state with powers of execution, for the will of the few, indeed for the exercise of his own will. He is aiming to set up an alliance of the dominating few with no regard for the essential organs of law or justice. The decisions in Paris are not the decisions of the Conference; they are the decisions of the "Big Three." But the point here is that President Wilson is no longer the idol of Europe. He is hated. They wish he were back in the United States, and the fact contributes to the blur that is Paris.

The situation in Palestine contributes also to the blur. Reports, seemingly authentic, reached me that the Zionist movement in Palestine threaten seriously the relations between the East and the West. Mr. Balfour's statement of a year ago, substantially approved subsequently by President Wilson, that Palestine should be a

national home for the Jews has resulted in a large influx of Jews in that land, many of whom are pressing every advantage. The new Jewish university with Hebrew as its basal language, the threat to reduce the Moslem temple on Zion, the social and the economic meaning of it all, have naturally aroused the opposition not only of the 750,000 Moslems in Palestine but of the Greek and Latin Christians as well. Civil war is spreading in the land. There have been massacres in various places. Two hundred were recently killed in Aleppo and two thousand are known to be missing. But the seriousness of all this transcends the danger in Palestine. The Holy War pleaded for by the Germans and denied by the Moslems, on the ground that the Koran provides for a Holy War only against the whole Christian world, and that it was therefore impossible to launch the Holy War with Germany as an ally, is now within the realm of the practically possible. The lighted match in Palestine is threateningly close to the powder of the whole Moslem world. When one recalls that there are 300,000,000 of these Moslems, that they have been secretly acquiring large amounts of munitions of war, and that they are unhappy in Egypt, in India, and elsewhere, one senses the possibilities of a still greater war.

When one remembers that the covenant for the League of Nations provides for the abrogation of the long line of arbitration treaties set up especially through the last hundred years, for the abrogation of the Wilson-Byran treaties, for the disestablishment of existing international law, and when one recalls the importance of such law especially in democracies, the smudge that is Paris does not lighten, it deepens.

## PARIS NOTES

By the Editor

### TROUBLES IN HOLLAND

THERE are many still small voices in Paris these days (April 1). The aspirations of new and liberated countries meet one at every turn. While Holland is neither a new nor a liberated country, old, indeed, yet she is in trouble. "We have no friends," sadly said one of her publicists to the writer. There are people here who laugh at her because, in her capital city is what "Le Journal" of Paris, playing upon words, recently described as "The Useless Palace of Peace in the Sleeping Wood." But more important than this, Holland is charged with having been neutral through this war, with having a strong pro-German faction in her Government, with willingly harboring the German Kaiser, with aiding the cause of Germany through the instrumentality of Dutch diplomats especially in the Far East, and with permitting German troops to leave Belgium by crossing the Holland province of Limburg. On the top of these charges there has been no little talk of adding Limburg to Belgium, and of taking from Holland the southern part of the province of Zeeland, near the mouth of the Scheldt. Surely these are reasons for anxiety among the Dutch people, and that

anxiety exists. We have been to no little pains to ascertain the facts.

Of course, it is a fact that Holland has been neutral through the war and that because of her geographical situation this neutrality has been extremely difficult to maintain. She has been injured as a result of military operations, both through the activities of the Allies and of the Germans. It is perfectly proper to think of her as having been between the upper and the nether millstone. As a neutral, her two outstanding efforts have been to bring about a peace as speedily as possible, and to relieve distress. Her efforts in the direction of peace were promoted in part by honest and high-minded men, and in part by pro-German influences, but outside the Government. From our point of view, this last is the most unhappy thing, itself easily explainable, that can be said against Holland. Her efforts to relieve distress have been, as we believe, conducted in a large and beneficial spirit. Having many refugees within her borders, some from Germany, and some from Belgium and England, differences and misunderstandings have inevitably arisen; but her services in this particular have been real, lawful, humanitarian and successful.

It is not true that Holland has supported the German war activity, neither did she allow German troops to pass through her territory into Belgium. Neither of these charges, frequently made, can be given any credence whatsoever. A large majority of the Dutch people are decidedly pro-French. The mobilization of her armies was, of course, along the German border, and against the military machine of the Central Powers. If there have been protests by the Allies because of any details in the behavior of Holland there have been more from Germany. It is not reasonable to expect a people to be especially friendly to a country that has sunk her ships of commerce, as Germany has preyed upon the commerce of Holland. It is true that the Dutch course has shown no disposition to court the experience of Belgium, Serbia, and Rumania; indeed there has been no reason why she should. None of the reasons which drove the other countries to war with Germany apply to Holland. Indeed, this little gift of the Rhine which we Americans have every reason for cherishing has been a buffer state, quite as the Great Powers have planned from of old.

Holland stands firmly upon her rights today, and proposes to resist any aggression upon them. She has suffered because of this war, but her conscience is clear. The charge that she has become prosperous because of the war is a myth. She has no fats, no coal, and her debt and taxes have increased enormously. As one Hollander says: "Many factories have had to shut their doors, traffic has been hampered, agriculture and cattle-breeding has declined, a number of our trading vessels have been sunk, or commandeered by the associated Powers, communications with our own colonies are next to impossible, hundreds of our fishermen have lost their lives, many have been thrown out of employment, and at a time when prices for the necessities of life have reached a dangerous height. Many foods are upon a ration basis, and many of our people are greatly underfed."

It is true that there are some members of the recent Dutch Cabinet, now unhappily in power, with more or less pro-German leanings. But that situation will soon melt away under the influence of the justice of the victors in the war. It is true that the German Kaiser and his son are on Holland's soil. But no responsible authority has applied for the extradition of the German Kaiser, and the Dutch Government points out that for many centuries dethroned sovereigns and oppressed peoples have found shelter within her boundaries. The list is a long one—Charles II, Descartes, the Bohemians, the French Huguenots after the Edict of Nantes, our own Pilgrim forefathers for eleven years preceding 1620.

The passage of German troops through Holland on their retreat out of Belgium was a benefit to the Belgian people, and does not seem worthy of discussion. In any event the German troops were disarmed. Furthermore, there are armed English and American bases in Holland at the present time which come nearer violating neutrality than anything else charged against Holland.

We are inclined to believe that the Dutch diplomats, often charged with the welfare of German interests in foreign lands, have conducted themselves as well as could be expected. On the whole, the representatives of the Dutch Government have been of great assistance to Allied interests in countries where these were at the mercy of hostile Governments. There is the work of Mr. Von Vollenhoven, who remained in charge of the Netherlands Legation at Brussels and conducted his work with distinguished skill. The same can be said of the services rendered by Mr. Oudendijk at Petrograd.

Belgian territorial claims upon Limburg consist in the claim that she was taken from Belgium in 1830. The answer to this charge is that Belgium did not exist at that time, and consequently such a surgical operation was impossible. But at this writing this imperialistic ambition of Belgium seems about to be abandoned.

Holland has been in a most delicate situation and sorely tried. But if we are just we shall remember that many prisoners of war have been looked out for by private charities in Holland, that refugee children from the north of France have found temporary homes there, and that in many other ways Holland has been the good Samaritan when a good Samaritan was needed. While guns purchased and paid for by Holland in America were never delivered to Holland, American relief to Belgium and northern France has been possible because of the neutral waters of the Scheldt which neutral Holland has kept open. Still more the heart of Holland is and naturally has been anti-German. The land which contains the little city of Delft, where side by side rest the remains of Hugo Grotius and William the Silent, the people who have breathed the breath of liberty since long before the French Revolution could not be otherwise with the militarized thing we now know as Germany. And this in spite of the fact that Germany has systematically cultivated Holland.

America should now turn to Holland, arrange for the interchange of students, study the need there, promote a more extensive commercial intercourse, be the friend that Holland needs, remembering what the peo-

ple of that freedom-loving nation have done for the progress of right thinking across the world.

#### IRELAND KNOCKS AT THE DOOR

As a sample of the complications facing the peace makers here the following communication received April 1 from Sean I. O'Ceallaigh, representative in Paris "of the provisional government of the Irish Republic," is cited. Mr. O'Ceallaigh is sending the matter to all of the delegates to the Conference:

"Ireland is a nation which has exercised the right of self-determination in harmony with the principles formulated by President Wilson, and accepted by the belligerents as the only sure foundation for a world peace. It is not only in the past that Ireland, generation after generation, has striven by force of arms as well as by all pacific means to regain her national freedom. At the General Election last December, the issue, and the only issue, placed before the Irish people was the independence of their country, and by a majority of more than three to one the representatives elected by the constitutional machinery of the ballot box are pledged to the abolition of English rule in Ireland. In none of the small nationalities with which the Peace Conference has hitherto occupied itself is the unanimity of the people so great; in none has the national desire for freedom been asserted so unmistakably and with so much emphasis. Following upon the General Election, an Irish National Assembly has met; an Irish Republic has been constituted and proclaimed to the world; a President has been appointed, and with him Ministers to direct different Departments of State; a programme of domestic policy has been issued; and an appeal has been addressed to the nations of the world to recognize the free Irish State that has thus been recalled to life. But while the national will has been declared and the mechanism of free government is ready, the former is being stifled and the latter paralyzed by England's ruthless exercise of military power. The President is a fugitive; the Irish Parliament is forced to conduct its business in secret; the most elementary civil rights are abrogated; courts martial are sitting at every center; and the gaols are filled with prisoners, victims of every brutality and indignity, whose only offence is that they have sought the freedom of their native land. It is in these circumstances that the Irish nation, through me, addresses the Peace Conference.

"Ireland manifestly comes within the scope of the principles that have been endorsed by the civilized nations, and it is for the application of these principles that the Peace Conference is now sitting. Ireland is weak; England is strong. Ireland in every possible way has asserted her right to freedom, which England, by sheer militarism, is intent now as always in the past to destroy. It is only by the exercise of tyrannical power that Ireland's right to freedom can be denied. It is to the great principle of national freedom, represented and embodied in the Peace Conference, that Ireland, exhausted by the cruelties of English rule, her population annihilated by one-half within living memory, her industries destroyed, her natural resources wasted, her

civil liberties ended, her chosen leaders proscribed and treated as felons, now makes her appeal.

"Article 10 of the draft covenant of the League of Nations is framed to secure national independence against the aggression of an external power. Its terms are as follows:

"The High Contracting Powers undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Executive Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

"Ireland, as a nation that has declared its independence and is pledged to the principles of freedom, justice, and peace, desires to subscribe to the Covenant of the League and to claim as against England the protection of Article 10. I submit to the Conference with profound respect that Ireland's claim is clear and cannot with any shadow of justice be refused. Should it be rejected the consequences would be as follows:

1. Ireland henceforth must rely for her deliverance wholly upon her own efforts. No such rule has been laid down with regard to any other of the smaller nationalities whose emancipation has been made the care of the Conference.

2. Nations which never have denied the right of Ireland to freedom will deprive themselves for the future of the power of countenancing her claim, and will in consequence be bound, for the first time in history, to leave her unaided to her own resources as indicated in the preceding paragraph.

3. Article 10 will impose upon all nations, as a condition of membership of the League, the obligation to guarantee to Great Britain a title to the possession of Ireland and dominion over the Irish people.

"Against the imposition of such slavery upon Ireland, and especially against the giving of such a guarantee of title to Great Britain, I enter on behalf of the people of Ireland, in whose name I have the honor to speak, the most emphatic protest.

"Great Britain's title to Ireland rests solely upon 'the military power of a nation to determine the fortunes of a people over whom they have no right to rule except the right of force.'

"The combined guarantee of such a title against the declared protest of Ireland would constitute a definite denial of 'the principle of Justice to all peoples and nationalities and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether strong or weak,' and without the acceptance of that principle 'no part of the structure of international justice can stand.'

"The guarantee of such a title would be subversive of 'the reign of law based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.'

"The guarantee of such a title would constitute recognition of the right of a strong power to serve its own material interest and advantage through the exercise of its 'exterior influence and mastery.'

"The guarantee of such a title would give Great

Britain a warrant to make a nation weaker than herself 'subject to her purposes and interests.' It would confirm the claim of Great Britain to rule and dominate the people of Ireland 'even in her own internal affairs by arbitrary and irresponsible force.'

"Any guarantee, under Article 10, of territorial integrity and political independence as affecting Ireland, can rightly enure only to the benefit of the people of Ireland themselves.

"In the name, therefore, of the people of Ireland, I ask that the Irish nation may be invited to give their adhesion to the Covenant of the League of Nations, and that membership of the League—a membership available under article 7 even to Colonies who have freely and legislatively subscribed to the supremacy of the English Imperial Parliament—shall not be denied to the Government of a free independent Irish Republic."

### RUSSIA'S PLEA

By BARON F. A. KORFF\*

RUSSIAN people feel very badly about the way the Peace Conference is working, not only on account of the methods of handling the purely Russian question, but especially because of the consequences such a policy will have for the whole civilized world.

For some time it has been evident to most enlightened people that there can be no peace unless Russia is admitted to the Council of Nations. This, however, cannot happen, unless order in Russia is re-established and anarchy stopped; in turn, this can be achieved only on the sole condition of ending the Bolshevik régime. There was a time when this could have been done with great easiness and only a small effort on the part of the Allies; now the question is much more complicated and difficult to resolve.

For months the Russians have been asking for help and hardly any was forthcoming; moreover, the assistance granted was usually given by the wrong end and means. We have a striking example in the case of Odessa, where the weak French help and political interference only provoked a gathering of strong Bolshevik forces, which finally took hold of the whole southern region.

Russians, asking for help and assistance, realize very well all the difficulties an armed intervention in Russia will encounter; they know the abhorrence of modern democracies to any form of military intervention, as well as the great weariness of the Allied peoples after this frightful war; but they also know that assistance can be given in ways other than that of armed men, regiments or divisions; they would be quite satisfied for any assistance and help, economic or moral. For some time back Russians have heard no word of encouragement from the Allied Governments and do not even know if they are looked at, at present, as Allies, neutrals or enemies.

The first thing to do, in consequence, for those who want a firm European peace established in the near fu-

ture, is for the Allies to help Russia to get out of her state of anarchy, by telling the Russians that they are still their friends and not their foes; in other words, by giving them sincere moral support. Secondly, by granting any possible economic or financial assistance; boots or shirts are just as valuable as cartridges and artillery; for months, for instance, the Russian south has been without anæsthetics, and hundreds of patients and wounded have been operated upon without ether or chloroform, some of them even committing suicide rather than to undergo such operations.

Russians realize, too, that Western Democracies have apprehensions as to the return of reaction or autocracy in Russia, after order will be established. Concerning the latter danger, one must say that the longer anarchy lasts the more chances for a reactionary régime there will be, and the longer help from the outside is delayed, the more likely such a reactionary success would be. Consequently it would seem to be the direct interest for the Allied nations to assist Russia in avoiding such a danger. Fortunately the Russian Democrats do not fear this reaction, as they know and are absolutely convinced of the democratic feelings and ideals of their people; of all peoples of the world the Russians are one of the most democratic. However, realizing the fears of the Western Nations, the Russians are quite willing to give guarantees for the establishment of a democratic form of government in the regions of liberated Russia. If help can be given on such a condition, most of the honest Russians would agree without the slightest hesitation. For example, there could be required from Russia, in case the Allies would send the necessary assistance, the immediate convocation of a Constitutional Assembly; if a Pan-Russian Assembly would still be impossible, one for Siberia could be elected in no time. Other guarantees, if necessary, could be added with the mutual consent of the Allies and Russians. Thus would be satisfied the rightful demands of the Western Democracies and *any form* of help or intervention could be made really *democratic*.

Of all nations of the world, Russia can probably least afford such bloodshed as is taking place in our day; it is her educated class that is suffering worst of all and it is this class that is so much smaller numerically in Russia than in the other countries; consequently, when the time of reconstruction will come, as it is bound to come, there will be left far too few educated people to help Russia in getting an enlightened and liberal form of government. It is this reason that forces the Russians, no matter how disagreeable such a request may be to their national pride, to ask for assistance.

Lately, however, the danger of Bolshevism is looming far beyond Russia proper, and the day might easily come when some of the Western Nations will be seriously threatened by it. There is no doubt whatever that Bolshevism is a social disease and a very *contagious* one, too, and no nation can deem itself absolutely immune, whatever its social conditions may be. The great weariness that overcame the people of the world the moment the war was over helps very much to create everywhere social discontent. Many other causes also aid in fostering class hatred and all sorts of dissatisfaction, which also lead to possible cases of Bolshevism. Now, it is

\* This article was written in Paris, April 20th, after repeated interviews between its author and the editor of THE ADVOCATE.